



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

appeared my review of the Pericla Navarchi Magonis, a study chiefly of vocabulary, usage, and syntax. By intermingling quotations from these writings of differing purpose and structure, the rejoinder may confuse readers. I do not feel disposed to answer, in these columns, the parts of the rejoinder bearing on the article in *The Classical Journal*. The question at issue in *THE CLASSICAL WEEKLY* is one of scholarship, not of personal feeling.

In my review of the Mago, the material was spread before the readers for them to test for themselves. It would be interesting to see what the College Entrance Examination Board would do with similar matter, if it should be offered by candidates. The rejoinder manifests not a glimmering of the significance of my study of the vocabulary of the Mago, in its relation to the problem of instruction in our Schools. "For him (me)", runs the rejoinder, "Latin literature is forever confined to the vocabulary of four ancient writers". In my review I granted the *boy* reader all the words in Lewis's Elementary Latin Dictionary, before uttering a word of criticism. In the Preface of that Dictionary we read:

"The vocabulary has been extended to include all words used by Catullus, Tibullus, Propertius, and Tacitus (in his larger works), as well as those used by Terence, Caesar, Sallust, Cicero, Livy, Nepos, Vergil, Horace, Ovid, Juvenal, Phaedrus, and Curtius".

Comment is surely unnecessary. "All Latin nevertheless is not preparatory Latin". Certainly not; the Latin of the Mago is not. That is my point.

The instances of *pro* may be left to the consideration of scholars. They were not available when Hand wrote his treatise.

What I said about *sub itinere* is not answered by citation of the time phrase *sub profectioe*. I raised the question whether *sub itinere* occurs in a Latin author. When I discreetly seek the protection of the interrogation point, it is truly humorous to be rebuked for speaking "so positively".

In regard to the citation from Cicero Phil. II.8, grammarians may feel, as Cicero did, a difference between this gerundive construction and the ablative of the stuff on which one feeds. Cicero, in common with others, uses the bare ablative in the latter case. Vergil uses *pascere* over fifty times, but never has a preposition with his ablative of the food. The evidence is overwhelmingly against the usage in the Mago.

In the discussion of *ab undis iactati*, there was neglect of my remark:

"The preposition with ablative in such phrases does occur in poetry, or in emotional passages involving personification, but the use is surely not to be imitated in ordinary narrative prose".

Well, is it?

Prorsus, perquam, and *alioquin* I do not "consider Apuleian", in the sense implied. What I said was: "Like Apuleius, Dr. Avellanus is fond of" them. The comparison is striking, as the data would show, but there is no criticism in it.

C. H. FORBES.

REVIEW

The Environment of Early Christianity. By S. Angus. New York; Charles Scribner's Sons, (1915). Pp. 240. 75 cents.

Dr. Angus's manual is an excellent addition to an excellent series (Studies in Theology). It deals concisely and brilliantly with the most fascinating chapter in human history, that blending of Greek and Roman and Hebrew cultures which formed what

Eusebius called the Preparation for the Gospel. The difficult task of 'boiling down' so vast and important a mass of material into the compass of this little volume has been achieved with remarkable success, and no better brief survey is known to me. Of course the book has the defects of its qualities: the style, which at best is incisive and epigrammatic, tends at times to suffer from compression and to become choppy and staccato, colloquial and careless; yet this effort at brevity does not prevent a certain amount of repetition. On the other hand, if space permitted, many a lucid summary of great movements and wide influences at work in the Graeco-Roman world could be quoted from its readable pages, as for instance this paragraph about the Greek genius:

Greek genius was nothing if not systematic. The Greek could not carry two thoughts without systematising, correlating, or subordinating. No half-knowledge, no confused piling of ideas, no chaotic learning, but ordered mastered learning. He arranged, scheduled, labelled. Epistemology was born with the Greek. He laid down the canons to which thought must conform to be valid, discovered the categories with a view to precise thinking. He put his intellectual house in order. He felt the need of harmony, and sought unity in diversity and diversity in unity. The Greeks were the first real philosophers. They took great pains in reclaiming the domain of knowledge and mapping it out. They converted everything into an art. They found the confusion of Oriental warfare, and *they* evolved tactics; they found the Egyptians measuring fields, and *they* built up geometry and mathematics; they learned writing from the Phoenicians, but *they* wrote; they found men compiling chronicles, and *they* made it history; out of conflicting methods of social cohesion, *they* made politics; from theories of conduct and undefined right and wrong, *they* made ethics; they found men arriving at conclusions, and *they* invented logic; lastly, *they* turned the content of the Gospel into a theology.

Though this hand-book is one of a series of Studies in Theology, it is equally of service to students of the Classics, as the titles of some of its chapters will show: The New Era Beginning with Alexander the Great, Social and Moral Conditions of the Graeco-Roman World, Religious Conditions of the Graeco-Roman Period, The Jew, The Greek, The Roman, The Language of Christianity. It is, in short, a very vivid and suggestive sketch of the Graeco-Roman background of the New Testament, and it presents in a nutshell the results of very wide reading in Greek and Latin authors. Numerous and illuminating citations and references are made, and many instructive parallels are suggested between ancient and modern life and thought. Like our own civilization Hellenism, spread over the ancient world by Alexander's conquests, was a 'melting-pot' of the nations—a 'mixing-bowl', in the striking expression of the pseudo-Plutarch, and this easy and interesting survey of that momentous process may be cordially commended to all students of the movements and ideas that more than all others have created the modern world.

HOBART COLLEGE.

HERBERT H. YEAMES.